THEOLOGY

L. L JULY, 1947 No. 325

Editorial

When reporting last September the publication in the U.S.A. of *The vised Standard Version of the New Testament*, which is to be followed in 50 by a corresponding new version of the Old Testament, we sug- ted that a committee of British scholars might be appointed to report it with a view to its being authorized, with any recommended modi- ations, for reading in church in this country. We pointed out that s was the procedure that was adopted in America with regard to the glish Revised Version of 1881. The *Revised Standard Version* has now n available here for some time, and from many who have been lking its acquaintance we have received confirmation of our own very h opinion of its excellence. It is with some surprise that we have rned of the proposal to set in motion in Great Britain an entirely new nslation of the Bible. It seems very doubtful whether anything can produced at present that will be more suitable for the purpose visaged than the *Revised Standard Version*. We should have thought t the best course would have been to authorize for an experimental riod the reading in church of this version, and only if after due trial it s deemed unsatisfactory to call upon our own scholars to embark on the prodigious task of producing yet another version. If it were case that there were plenty of British scholars with time and energy their hands and freedom from other pressing demands, the position uld be different. But so far as we can ascertain this is not the case. therefore hope that it may not be too late for the course which we ve suggested to be seriously considered, and that it will be rejected y if something other than publishing interests tells against it.

* * *

Your Sunday in Danger[1] has not had a good press, and we cannot say t it deserved one. Nevertheless, we hope that *faute de mieux* it will not neglected in the parishes. Sunday observance is a matter of practical ology into which the English layman may be expected to get his th more easily than into some of the matters that are commended his attention. Moreover, it is a subject which it is difficult to discuss sponsibly, since everyone has to observe Sunday somehow. It is satisfactory that this Report, which is addressed to the laity much re than to the clergy, should have been prepared by an exclusively ical body. If it be replied that the laity are not represented in Con- cation, we would say so much the worse either for Convocation or for policy which remits a subject like this to Convocation when there is

[1] The Schedule to the Reports of the Joint Committees on Sunday Observance ented to the Convocations of Canterbury and York in May, 1947. Press and lications Board and S.P.C.K. 1s.

another body, in which the laity are represented, that could handle it equally well.

The Report makes a laudable attempt to be both practical and positive. "Principles" are consigned to an appendix, where they are indicated very briefly, though on the right lines. The body of the document concentrates on what ought to be done, but the connexion between what is proposed and the principles that are appended is not adequately brought out. Christians have a sorry record of negation in regard to Sunday observance, and the endeavour to be positive at all costs is welcome. We should have thought that the most positive thing about Sunday is that it is the weekly memorial of the Resurrection of our Lord, but there is only a single and incidental allusion to this in the body of the Report.

Some of the statements that are made must be attributed to careless drafting—e.g., "The man-power of the Ministry is at present sadly diminished but it will shortly begin to recover." It is said that while it is not *in itself* "wrong" to go to the cinema on Sunday, nevertheless, all things considered, churchpeople "can serve God and man better by staying away and it is therefore right for them to do so." Almost immediately afterwards churchpeople are told that they have "a positive duty to press in every possible way for better pictures on Sunday." The Report gives the impression that it is the *duty* only of churchpeople to worship God; do we no longer believe that it is the duty of *man*? Churchpeople acknowledge the duty, but not as something peculiar to themselves.

The Report might have done better if it had started by asserting that the institution of Sunday which we find in our tradition and in our midst is a sign to our nation that the Risen Lord is the Head of mankind and the invisible King of this and every country. The witness that is borne by the ordinance itself is prior to the witness that may be borne by the faithful observance of it. We miss in this Report the note that was struck by F. D. Maurice when he wrote: "We can say to every land: 'God, not man, has given you this day. God, not man, is testifying to your people, high and low, that He has redeemed you in His Son from death, the grave, from all the enemies that would separate you from Him. He invites you, all of you, to rest in Him, your Creator and Deliverer. There is the rest for the spirit of man. And the body is to have its own rest, that it may labour more freely, more effectually, more nobly. To all sons of toil, to all who work with the hands, or with the brain, God holds out the same gift, grounded on the same Redemption. It is part of His charter of freedom to the nations; let the nation which aspires to be free receive it at His hands.' "[1] There is ground enough for being practical and positive.

[1] *The Commandments considered as Instruments of National Reformation* (1866), pp. 71 f.

Christ the Healer of Intellectual and Spiritual Divisions[1]

"He is before all things, and in him all things consist."—Col. i, 17.

The life of a university consists in the free communication of meaning between those who share a common allegiance to the truth. If this pure love of truth fails, the life of a university comes to an end. The vitality of a university is shown in so using the various means by which truth may be discovered and disseminated that the realm of truth may be perpetually defended and enlarged.

This essential love of truth still lives to-day, and is one of our finest spiritual assets, but it is tinged with sadness and a sense of disappointment. So many in the present generation in Europe have thought that they were loving the truth and found that they were loving propaganda. They have therefore turned away disgusted and distressed. They have withdrawn into disillusioned silence. They look with cynical distrust at those who glibly speak of truth. And yet, no soul which is offended by falsehood has entirely lost the love of truth. Indeed, many have learned in the spiritual experiences of war, whether as victors or vanquished, a new and maturer readiness to seek the truth wherever it may be found. They are looking for those whom they can trust. Our real problem to-day is not to learn to love the truth but to restart the fundamental conversation in which the truth may be rediscovered. The impediment to the revival of this authentic conversation is not any lack of the technical means of communication. We are now all neighbours in one world. But we find that to be neighbours is not necessarily to be friends. Our conversational commerce with one another is impeded, not by technical but by intellectual and spiritual frontiers. Our confusion is increased because these traditional frontiers are now changing. Many people no longer find their living convictions expressed in the classic conversations between the great historical denominations which compose our social and religious tradition. The highways of the spirit in Europe are crowded with mental refugees. The world to-day is full of spiritually displaced persons. People are finding in the direct experience of personal relationships that they have a natural sympathy with those who are officially strangers and that they are spiritually out of sympathy with those who are officially friends. Our urgent need is so to overcome our intellectual and spiritual divisions that we may reopen the broken conversations and learn to speak and find the truth as friends.

It is true that social and economic conditions play a great part in enabling an authentic conversation to take place, but the fundamental problem is spiritual. The essential spiritual condition of real conversation is that both speakers must potentially appreciate the same kind of meaning. No meaning can be communicated if nothing has the same meaning for both. Nothing can be explained, if there is nothing which both accept as so plain as to require no further explanation. Even to come into conflict they need some point of contact in some

[1] A sermon preached before the University of Cambridge.

kind of common world. To converse with one another they must in some sense inhabit a common world of meaning. The instrument of language cannot link those who do not in some sense dwell in a common world in which that language may indicate or express similar meaning for both. What is true of the audible language of our lips is also true of the silent language of the soul. This inner language is infinitely subtle, but its instrumental value as a means of communication still depends on the fact that both partners in the conversation live in a common conversational world. Common thought forms, common analogies, common products of the intellectual imagination, common forms of description or explanation, all owe their utility to the fact that those who use them in conversation already share some common form of meaning. They can only speak the same vocal or mental language because they live in a common universe of discourse.

It follows that there can be no final victory over the divisions which divide us unless potentially all men inhabit a final world of common meaning. It is my conviction that the Christian tradition provides this common world of meaning in our relationship to the living Christ. We are united as members of the body of Christ. But to use such terms is hardly likely to have very much meaning for those who have lost touch with the thought and practice of the Christian Faith. Many of our contemporaries no longer think in scriptural language when they are thinking seriously of serious matters. One reason for the disuse of scriptural language in speech and thought is that many no longer have any effective acquaintance with the scriptural world in which the language of Scripture has its natural meaning and significance. It is not easy for an authentic conversation to arise between the Bible and those who no longer mentally live in the world of the Bible. Through the steady work of biblical scholars and teachers the meaning of the Bible is being more widely known and understood, but the task of reinterpretation will not be complete until we all learn to accept the language of Scripture, not as a substitute for our everyday ways of thinking but as the natural culmination of the ways in which we try to understand the world in which we live. Christ will never be recognized as the final reconciler of our intellectual and spiritual divisions if there is no one fundamental form of explanation which underlies all our derivative methods of seeking the truth and if He does not in the test of life satisfy the demands of this fundamental form of all explanation which is common to men as men.

It is natural to seek the meaning of the world. The character of the search is determined by the nature of those who make the search. We are persons. We think as persons. We understand as persons. We interpret as persons. We are seeking for what is plain meaning to persons. But the world of our experience is not penetrable to an equal depth at all points by the method of personal interpretation which we naturally use. We can in imaginative sympathy enter into the lives of other persons, but a great deal of the world of our experience appears to be impenetrable by this method. We know persons and their actions in a deeper sense than we know things and their changes. We thus distinguish the world around us into what is transparent and

at appears to be opaque to interpretation in personal terms. What transparent forms the personal world. What is opaque forms the personal world. We tend to understand this distinction as a separan into two independent worlds. This is misleading. What we term impersonal world is simply so much of the world around us as nains unexplained at any given time when we have made the utmost of the method of personal explanation. Within the personal world, use the methods of history. Within what appears to be the imperhal world, we cannot attain fully personal explanation and, therefore, pursue the methods of science which are less than personal. We nnot see the inner meaning but we can still see to take external asurements. It is in using the methods of personal or impersonal estigation that we become historians or scientists. Our methods ect our material and constitute our professional nature and our ofessional world. The use of a common method tends to unite those o use it and to exclude those who do not use it. Within the limits of common method scholars are able to converse with one another, n though their conclusions may differ. They have discovered or vised a departmental world of common meaning in which they can cuss such aspects of the truth as may be known by the method ich they are using. In this way they become members of what may termed "methodological denominations." Biblical critics, for ample, who use the same methods of biblical criticism realize that y are fellow workers, even though they may differ in nationality d belong to historically separated Christian denominations. Their nse of community does not depend on any necessary identity of their sults but upon the identity of their methods of investigation. Thus, original unity of our quest for the meaning of the world has been t. The single conversation has split into a plurality of increasingly related conversations. These methodological denominations have en superimposed upon our historical denominations. This has used a certain amount of confusion and strain. We face a threefold oblem. There is the lack of unity amongst the methodological denomations, and there is the lack of unity between them and the historical nominations, and there is the lack of unity between the historical nominations. The most promising way towards the solution of these tricate problems of conflicting loyalties is to continue the search for thodological reunion.

We cannot restore the unity of our original quest by a still more siduous use of any of the derived methods. We must retrace our steps d study afresh the simple unbroken unity of our initial search. We ust seek to discover within it the unifying form of explanation which so urgently need. Before the unity of the original search broke into rsonal and impersonal investigation, we were facing the world as rsons and seeking an explanation which might satisfy us as persons. o explanation can satisfy us as persons which ends in an impersonal timate. For us, a world which is finally impersonal has no explanaon. Final explanation for us must give significance to the finest manistations of personal life which we know. When we catch a glimpse in hers of the meaning of true personality, our busy questionings die on

our lips. We have seen something of the answer. We have for a moment known something of the satisfaction of final explanation in our encounter with perfect personality. Innumerable grave problems remain, but we have seen the type of personal life which makes the true meaning of life plain. Perfect personality is our final form of explanation. It is that in terms of which we are bound to give all final explanation. To seek to explain perfect personality is to depart from the plainest category which we know. To ask for further explanation is pointless. Further explanation will only explain away what has already been made plain. The process of explanation reaches its natural culmination when the moment of maximum plainness has been reached.

If it be true that final explanation can be found only in the perfect encounter with perfect personality, it will follow that each subordinate method of explanation is adequate in so far as it is fully personal. Each is adequate in so far as it is utilizing the whole personality of the investigator and is seeking an explanation which is wholly personal. All methods which are less than personal leave some essential questions unasked or unanswered. The way towards methodological reunion is to appreciate the hierarchy of our various methods as springing from the fundamental and final method of personal explanation. The breadth and depth of our conversations will be restored as we learn to make proper and free use of every method within the context of the final method of personal explanation.

The proper and free use of any method requires self discipline on the part of those who use it. The good historian and the good scientist must possess the spiritual qualities and loyalties which are essential for the proper use of their methods. The same is true of the method of personal explanation. Those who use this method must pursue purity of heart and mind because it is through the instrument of their own personalities that they learn to appreciate the operations of personalities far finer and far greater than their own. Any spiritual defects in their own personalities limit the range of their sympathy and understanding.

Moreover, each method has its own implied affirmations about the character of what is being investigated. As long as we try to make sense of the world, we imply our faith that when the world is fully understood, it will manifest the kind of sense for which we are seeking. Every question anticipates an answer which is congruous to the question. Both question and answer are elements in the same conversational world. The unity of the conversation depends on the fact that those who are taking part in the conversation are conversing about the kind of world which can be examined in that kind of conversation. Every method contains implicit affirmations about the kind of world which can be examined by that particular method. This is true of the method of personal explanation. If, however, this is the fundamental form of explanation which all men naturally use, the implicit affirmations of this method are specially significant. They are noteworthy because they disclose some of the characteristics which the world must have if it is to be capable of explanation to us as persons. What then are some of the implicit affirmations contained within the use of the method of

rsonal explanation? The fundamental implication of the personal ethod is that the ultimate must be personal. To us an impersonal timate is an explanation neither of itself nor of anything derived from Neither its being nor its reason for being is plain to us. If we retain r faith in the possibility of final explanation, we are bound to believe at the ultimate is fully personal. What we are really seeking is not a w explanatory words or ideas of principles but a person who is the planation. We are seeking not the last word on the nature of reality t a person who is that reality and able eternally to utter self-planatory words. Final explanation is the perfect meeting of a rson with the personal ultimate. This perfect meeting can be ilitated by meeting those who stand more closely to the personal timate than we do ourselves. But the perfect representative of the rsonal ultimate is one who makes the ultimate perfectly present to us. he only way in which a person may be perfectly present is for him to present himself and not through a representative. Real presence nnot be by deputy. Nothing less will satisfy us than the personal anifestation of the personal ultimate. But we cannot remain un-sponsive in the presence of perfect personality. It demands recogni-on, decision, service. To refuse these is to remain impersonal in the ce of a personal invitation. We cannot remain spectators. We must come fellow workers. The final experience of explanation is not mply to know the will of the ultimate but to do it. Life receives planation in so far as it becomes a vocation. Our natural desire is to e an unfrustrated and significant life in company with all men. But r very awareness of what would be a state of full explanation scloses to us how very far our actual condition is from the position in hich we would like to be. Both individually and socially our lives are mpeded by spiritual disunity. Our present lack of spiritual unity in the orld is so serious that we are tempted to think that no restoration or hievement of unity is possible. But to accept spiritual disunity as timate is to sacrifice our faith in the possibility of final explanation. hours of depression we may be inclined to make that sacrifice, but e know that to do so would be to deny our own true nature. Even in ch an hour of spiritual defeat we begin a spiritual resistance move-ent which waits for the dawn. Those who retain their faith in final planation are bound to believe that our spiritual divisions are not superable. A division is in reality only insuperable when those who nd divided are not members of a larger unity which includes them th. True spiritual unity is not artificially manufactured but per-nally discovered. Methodological unity is discovered when investi-tors realize that they are persons before they are specialists and that eir methods yield final satisfaction in so far as they are personal. mewhat similarly, members of historical denominations, whether ligious or social, can discover that their divisions are unreal or mis-nceived when they realize that they are fellow members of a greater derlying unity. The reason for our spiritual divisions, when they are t due to a rejection of the conditions of all personal unity, is that we not realize our real unity. Our faith affirms spiritual unity; our sight s spiritual disunity. We are constrained to believe that spiritual unity

is real, but we cannot see it to be real. The fact that our present spiritual vision is limited means that we cannot by our own limited vision enable ourselves to see the truth. We must rely on receiving a quality of spiritual vision which we cannot achieve ourselves. We are ultimately compelled to receive an explanation which we cannot give ourselves. Our trust in the possibility of receiving this final explanation is increased by our experience of learning to see greater spiritual unities through the help of those who have inspired us by their lives and good examples. Under their spiritual leadership, we have found our trivial disunities disappearing or being transformed. The final spiritual unity can arise only through our acceptance of the spiritual initiative of the personal ultimate. No lesser initiative can offer more than a partial reconciliation. We become reconciled to one another in accepting the reconciling initiative of the ultimately personal in whom we are united. It is this initiative from outside ourselves which enables us to begin the spiritually reconciling conversation which is called repentance and forgiveness. We enter this world of final explanation through an individual response, but the response is made in society and the new life which follows is lived in society. The final implication is that the life of this responsive society must be in some sense eternal. There is no explanation if all ends in silence.

But these affirmations which lie implicit in the form of explanation, which we naturally use in seeking to understand the world of our experience, are familiar to us as elements in the Christian faith. The Christian doctrine of God, of the Incarnation, of the Atonement, of the Church, of the Last Things, all meet the natural demands and expectations of the way in which we are bound to think if the world around us has any final meaning for us at all. Naturally, the mental and verbal expressions of Christian doctrines show the influence of contemporary forms of explanation. These classic formulations and explanatory forms are adequate in so far as they are truly personal. The truly personal is known to us in Christ. He is the supreme manifestation of our natural form of explanation. He is the explanation of all things. He cannot be explained or expressed in terms other than His own. He eludes and escapes all definitions and explanations which in the last resort are more than the simple acceptance of Himself as Himself. The real denial of His divinity is to think that we can find a higher form of explanation than He is in Himself. Any effort to interpret the work of Christ is satisfactory in so far as it is truly personal. Impersonal analogies and analogies drawn from social relationships, which even when restored are less than fully personal, cannot give a full insight into the work of Christ. He cannot be fully explained or interpreted in any terms which are essentially pre-Christian.

I believe that the pure love of truth culminates in the pure love of God as revealed in Christ and that our real duty is not to explain Christ but to accept Him as the explanation. In accepting Him as the living explanation of all life, I believe that we find that our intellectual and spiritual divisions either disappear or receive that degree of significance which in reality they deserve. In the words of the Epistle to the Colossians, we have good reason to give thanks to God the Father,

delivered us out of the power of darkness, and translated us into
ngdom of the Son of his love; in whom we have our redemption,
rgiveness of our sins: who is the image of the invisible God, the
rn of all creation; for in him were all things created, in the
ns and upon the earth, things visible and things invisible, whether
s or dominions or principalities or powers; all things have been
d through him, and unto him; and he is before all things, and in
ll things consist."

G. F. Woods.

Prayers for the King

have recently been told that the Anglican worshipper ought to be
something better than the "merely Tudor sociology" which is all
s offered in the Book of Common Prayer (Dix, *The Shape of the*
y, p. 733). The point is shrewdly made at the end of a lengthy
nent for the revision of the liturgy. Perhaps it is hardly unfair to
at this suggestion of an out-of-date sociology seems designed to
the last citadel of those who remain stubbornly addicted to their
can inheritance. Without asserting that these prayers are un-
ble, we may fairly claim that they should be sympathetically
ed. Dom Gregory Dix very properly insists that his chapter on
eformation and the Anglican Liturgy should be read only in the
of the previous six hundred pages of his monumental work. Yet
hapter inevitably presents us with certain historical judgments
owe little or nothing to the preceding argument and must be
d on their merits.

no point in the story of the liturgy can we ignore its setting in
y, least of all when we come to the period of the Reformation.
logy does not move in a vacuum, and it is no discredit to the Book
mmon Prayer that it bears the marks of its historical origins. The
question is whether or not those origins will bear investigation. It
een stated that "the one definite thing which can be said about the
mation in England is that it was an act of State" (F. M. Powicke,
Reformation in England, p. 1). A still more certain thing is that the
sh Reformation does not lend itself to aphorisms. The modern
ian rightly lays emphasis on its political and social aspects. We
no longer regard the transactions of this complicated period of
y as products of a wholly unworldly faith or of unadulterated
gical reasoning. But equally we are not at liberty to set aside
gy, or to assume that Cranmer's royalism and the rest of Tudor
logy lacked all spiritual background.

ayers for the ruling authorities are no novelty in Christian worship.
rest ultimately on apostolic precept (1 Tim. ii, 1 ff.). Tertullian,
ng others, is a witness to the practice of the early Church. Chris-
pray for Cæsar's welfare in obedience to their Scriptures, and also

because they know that "a mighty shock, the very end of all things, only retarded by the continued existence of the Roman Empir (Apol. 32). The prayers, in fact, not only fulfil a formal religio obligation, they also express a Christian sense of social responsibili At a later date, the now professedly Christian rulers are referred to superlative terms of respect; they are εὐσεβέστατοι καὶ πιστότατοι (the phrase "our most religious and gracious King" which was quie removed in 1928 from our prayer for the High Court of Parliamen In medieval practice, the name of the sovereign was mentioned in t Canon together with the names of the reigning pope and the bishop the diocese. The tradition, then, is continuous. It is true, howev that prayers for the King and his ministers assume great prominence Tudor England, and lay new emphasis on the claims of civil ord loyalty and obedience.

The reason for this does not lie wholly on the surface. The source a significance of Tudor sociology are less simple than we might suppo We cannot, of course, ignore the conditions of the times. The outlook any age is determined, in no small degree, by the pressure of events. is as idle to deny as it would be foolish to deplore the influence politics. The new monarchy of the Tudors, whatever else may be s of it, united the country and promised the blessing of strong and sta government. The Wars of the Roses had not been forgotten. Engla was haunted all through the sixteenth century by bitter memories feudal and dynastic strife and by the dread of its recurrence. Sha speare's preoccupation with this theme is no accident. The coun which had trembled at Elizabeth's approaching death, breathed profound sigh of relief when it found, after all, that it was to be spa the perils of a disputed succession to the throne. The words in wh the translators of the Bible offered their work to "the Most High a Mighty Prince James" have been taken as an expression of fulso flattery. The first paragraph of the dedication is enough to show t this is a superficial judgment. The translators are found to be speak not as ecclesiastical courtiers but as representative Englishmen. If country rejoiced in the King's "hopeful Seed" and "undoubted titl it was because a final answer had been given to the question "Wh to direct the unsettled State?" The exaltation of the royal office not even a mere political device. The claims of civil government long since received the explicit and uncompromising sanction religion. In support of those claims free appeal was made to Script and the appeal was conscientious and not unjustified. The doctrin the divine right of kings was in origin and in essence an answer to unlimited pretensions of the Papacy. It was an assertion of the inher dignity of civil government. Obedience to rulers was claimed to "according to God's blessed Word and ordinance." If we are to cr the Reformers with the least degree of sincerity, we must see someth other than political expediency in the language of the Church's pray

This language, indeed, was the expression of a complete, and by means contemptible, world-view. In a recent study of Shakespea history plays, Dr Tillyard emphasizes what he calls their cos background. He makes it clear that Shakespeare, whatever his pers

s may have been, shared a certain pattern of thought with his mporaries. This comprehensive "body of doctrine" is given free ssion in the well-known speech of Ulysses on "degree" or order:

> O, when degree is shaked,
> Which is the ladder to all high designs,
> The enterprise is sick ! How could communities,
> Degrees in schools and brotherhoods in cities,
> Peaceful commerce from dividable shores,
> The primogenity and due of birth,
> Prerogative of age, crowns, sceptres, laurels,
> But by degree, stand in authentic place?
> Take but degree away, untrue that string,
> And hark, what discord follows ! each thing meets
> In mere oppugnancy.
>
> (*Troilus and Cressida* 1, iii.)

amnon's counsellor is, of course, a Tudor statesman in Greek ise, and these lines may be held to reflect nothing more than mporary political opinion. The passage as a whole forbids this retation. Its references to the heavens, the planets and the nts, and the undertones of such words as "discord" and "chaos," us that the Tudor Ulysses is dealing with matters of far deeper icance. He is speaking of the divine order of the universe. This , which must be reflected in human society, and in Man himself is a world in miniature, is held to embrace angels and men and mate creation in a divinely appointed "chain of being." It is the of a broken order, of the return of chaos, that gives such tenseness to espearean tragedy. We must take account of a pattern of thought n made of the universe a majestic whole. This pattern was not, was it regarded as, a new discovery; it was a legacy of the Middle and was shaped, in the main, by the doctrines of Christianity. Tudor sociology has, surely, some claim to our respect, if its fun- ntal assumptions are those not only of contemporary politicians, and ecclesiastical, but of Shakespeare and Spenser, and thinkers stamp of Sir Thomas Elyot and Hooker, and if its classic expo- made no claim to be regarded as innovators. We find, after all, it has no mean pedigree.

s instructive to set beside our prayers for the King the homily ncerning Good Order and Obedience." This is a characteristically r composition, with its insistence on the enormity of civil strife, riptural illustrations of the duty of passive obedience, and its side- es at the usurped authority of Rome. The long opening para- , however, sets all this in true perspective. In a manner no less cteristic of the age, it praises the "goodly order of God" in heaven arth, in nature and in man. It is designed to show that the principle ordination and obedience is of divine authority and universal cation. The language is simple; it was intended for the pulpit; he theme is profound, and it underlies the reasoning of Hooker's sophical first book *Concerning Laws*. Hooker, too, tells us that the of angels "is that which disposes them as an Army; one in order and e above another"; that "obedience of Creatures unto the Law of

Nature is the stay of the whole World"; and that "the case of Man nature standing as it doth, some kind of Regiment the Law of Natur doth require." This is the background against which we must set th State prayers of our liturgy. Those who affect to dislike the suggestio that a Christian government's first duty is to punish (Dix, p. 733) ma be asked how its more positive functions (the ordering of all things c the best and surest foundations—a sufficiently comprehensive tas can be carried out in a society which is allowed to think lightly of th claims of order and the duty of obedience.

The Prayer Book undoubtedly throws the weight of its emphasis c duties, but we must not overlook the fact that the duties embra subjects and government alike. If the King is to know "whose minist he is," he must recognize not only the dignity of his office but also h personal accountability to God. An old commentator on the Pray Book tells us that the Communion Collect for the King is proper placed immediately after the Commandments, because the King is th guardian of the two tables of the Law (*custos utriusque Tabula* Wheatly's suggestion (unlike some attempts to invest accidents history with theological significance) is not trivial. It calls attention the doctrine which is implicit in the prayer itself. If the King is t defender of God's law, he must be under obedience to that law; t will of God Himself, as Hooker insists, is not arbitrary (E.P. i, 2). W may justly claim that the Church, by resting the dignity of governme on its proper basis, is revealing the only true security against t tyrannical abuse of power. Whether the age of the totalitarian state a fitting time to discard the language of our ancient prayers is question not lightly to be set aside. Whatever claims there may be f revision, this and certain other considerations should be borne in mir

(1) The prayers have survived four centuries of constitutio development, and it would be hard to prove that they have impos any strain on the sincerity of worshippers. There is, indeed, lit ground for objection to the emphasis placed on the person of t Sovereign. The precise powers which he may possess are not in questi the fact is that so long as we enjoy a monarchy, the King will repres in himself the fullness of the nation's life and its historical continui We may add that in the hereditary principle we have a valua reminder of the Christian truth that all legitimate government, wh ever its immediate source, is ultimately "of God." There is more th one way of asserting this truth, and every society must find a way itself. We have our own historic institutions, and modern democra for its own sake, needs to be constantly reminded of their significan We need, and we have, prayers for the King's ministers and Parliament (which includes His Majesty's Opposition), but it d not follow that the Sovereign must always be explicitly associa with those in authority under him. The Collect for the King at Co munion, which asserts his peculiar functions in the life of Chu and State, is not redundant,[1] and it may be doubted whether its om

[1] The present argument does not call for a precise definition of the King's "go norship" of the Church. Nor does it depend on the fact, though it may well be hel bear on the issue, of establishment.

in the proposed Alternative Order (1928) was either wise or sary.

It is a sound Anglican principle that the liturgy must be rstanded of the people." This does not imply that the Church's rs should be framed to give expression to the spirit of the age. If e growing accustomed to put rights before obligations, and to rate mity above "degree," it has yet to be proved that we are wiser our fathers. History warns us, on the contrary, that the smoothing all distinctions does not necessarily make for social stability, and tianity and experience teach that obedience is the prerequisite of m.

We are apt to assume too readily that what is ancient must be te. The assumption rests on the fallacy that truths which to all rance have been universally accepted can be safely left to look themselves. The events of our own time are enough to show that ng of moral or spiritual value can be preserved without constant nce. Old battles which we fondly assumed to have been settled go are having to be fought out again to-day. It has been pointed at the period to which the Homilies belong was a classical period glish history "because things that are always present in human y so near to the surface" (Hoskyns, *Cambridge Sermons*, p. 178). lessons of such a period can hardly be dismissed as irrelevant to age, least of all to the age in which we live.

The modern world lacks a pattern of life, a generally recognized e into which new knowledge and new insights may be fitted, or ich, at least, they may be subordinated while clearer judgment of true significance is awaited. The sixteenth century possessed such ttern, and, as we have seen, it was fundamentally theological. nts indeed were at work, but they were not as yet strong enough sly to disturb an inherited belief in the order of the universe. believed in this order because they believed that it rested ulti- ly on God Himself. In the Prayer Book they asserted its claims on s and subjects alike. It is still the Church's task to point to this ler of God, the witness of the creation to its Creator" (Hoskyns, 12), and any failure here would surely be a betrayal of trust of culable harm to human society.

these facts are duly recognized, we may well hesitate to think y of our inheritance. It is hard to-day to resist the demand for new thing, especially when the demand is made in the name of ology." But if a reprieve for the old prayers is too much to expect is generation, we are free at least to ask for mitigation of sentence. age has not outgrown their lessons, and we owe it to the future, ss than to ourselves, to see that these lessons are neither mis- rstood nor cast aside.

W. S. T. Wright.

Expository Preaching

Expository Preaching is essential to the vitality of the Christia Church because by means of it people are fed upon the testimony the Scriptures to the Gospel of Jesus Christ. The Bible is the book the people of God in which they learn the way of God which leads life, and the way not of God which leads to death. Unless the Bible ca be freely, illuminatingly, and triumphantly handled inside the Churc the Church is uncertain of its own message and is rightly by-passed b the life of the world. Yet the Bible is a difficult book, and there a many wrong ways of expounding it. How shall we learn to prea expository sermons in such a way that God may use the preaching f the building up of His Church?

We must first of all learn to expound the Scripture for its own sak We shall learn to preach expository sermons which shall grip the min and hearts of men only if we want to learn to expound the Bible wheth or not we can make any use of this in preaching. We must want f ourselves to get a real grip upon our own Bible. We begin by taking passage which has a unity of its own according to a responsible scholar handling of the Bible. I am thinking here of a passage which has son content of truth or incident which invites reflection. There are, doubt, many passages in the Bible which defy exposition because th are catalogues or masses of detail, but we need not worry about thes If we can expound in a living way all the passages which seem promise some content, we shall do well. Into these passages we mu seek to enter with all the imaginative insight and practical comm ment at our disposal The Bible is concerned with the practical issu of life and speaks its word at the point where we act or do not act, a so we must live inside the passage if we are to lay hold of it. This difficult for us to do because the rush of modern life and its sup ficiality make us skim over what we read without committing oursel to it. We need to find the unity of theme in the passage and the w in which it is worked out in the details. This latter point is very i portant. We may easily find the theme of a Biblical passage expr sible in some modern phrase, which, however, means something deep if we take it in its Biblical context. It is in the details of a Biblic passage that the heart of the Bible often comes out—its strangeness a remoteness from modern life and its power to speak into modern lif word that shall change it. We must believe that in Scripture is a wo of urgent practical value and enter into that word.

But the Bible is of many parts and of very varied importance. W cannot handle it honestly so as to commend it to the Church and t world unless we take full account of the results of modern histori criticism. But the way in which those results influence our expositi is not by being themselves the centre of attention, but by modifying certain ways our understanding of the content of the passage and c appropriation of it. After we have listened—and really listened—to t passage as it stands, we must test it by four types of question:

(1) Are there any literary questions which must be taken account o the exposition of this passage? We are not here interested in liter

ons for their own sake, and if we can honestly and satisfactorily hem we ought to do so. But in some cases we ought to take nt of literary questions because an answer to them is essential to the ition of the passage. For example, in Genesis xxxvii it is necessary e account of the double strand in the story of Joseph in order to tice to it; in the Synoptic Gospels it may sometimes be necessary help to take account of what is said in the other Gospels—at times the comparison may be irrelevant and unhelpful to the ition.

Are there any historical questions which must be taken account he exposition of this passage? History has a special relation to the ian Gospel in that, while history itself is not the revelation of he revelation of God is a revelation in history, and this fact is greatest importance. There are three types of historical question should be noticed: (*a*) There are some historical questions have a certain relevance to the passage to be expounded but can safely be left unsettled (*e.g.*, the authorship of the first le of Peter is not always necessary to the exposition, and even the ation of the Epistle to the Galatians is only relevant at specific s). (*b*) There are other historical questions which must be red in some way if we are to expound properly (*e.g.*, the story unt Carmel has its place as part of the history of Israel, and how- difficult the problems involved, the exposition must include a l estimate of it as history; also in dealing with the miracles of , though the question what happened is not the first question, it t of the fact to be faced). (*c*) There are other historical questions ich what is narrated is not of importance as a reliable account of actually took place at the time indicated but is important as illuminating the thought and action of a later period or the faith d by the history. As an example of the first alternative we may great part of the Pentateuch; as examples of the second we may first the Covenant with Noah and also the saying in Mark xv, And the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the m."

Are there any moral questions which must be taken into account exposition of this passage? The Bible is the story of God's dealing mankind over a great stretch of years, and in that period the rstanding of God's moral will is not fixed and constant. We must account of these changes in moral outlook in our use of Scripture. we are concerned about is, recognizing to the full that every ge in the Bible must be brought to the test of the moral standard died in Jesus Christ our Lord, how does the passage, in spite of imitation it may have, give us some insight into the true relation n before God and of God's dealing with man? As an instance of oral question we may take the verse in the story of Elijah on Mount el (1 Kings xviii, 40): "And Elijah said unto them, Take the iets of Baal; let not one of them escape. And they took them: Elijah brought them down to the brook Kishon, and slew them ." Is that conduct befitting a Christian? If it is it needs justifica- if not, then the fact needs to be noted in the exposition.

(4) Are there any theological questions which must be taken accou of in the exposition of this passage? Not all of the Bible takes its sta from its centre in Jesus Christ our Lord. We have not, in expoundin to treat the Bible as if it were a cryptogram of that central messag having no message for us except as it typifies the free grace of Go declared in Jesus Christ our Lord. On the other hand, we do n expound rightly unless we show ourselves aware of the distance of ar passage from the centre and its relation to it. Here the theologic issues which may be raised seem to me to be three. The passage ma express a limited understanding of God, and this limitation can admitted without taking away its witness to the one true God, *e.g.* t passages in the Old Testament which understood Jehovah as bein one among many gods—for example in the story of Naaman (2 Kin v, 17). On the other hand, it may express a true understanding of G which is taken up into a fuller meaning in Christ, *e.g.* the passage Deut. iv, 32-40 which speaks of the greatness of the Mosaic covenan Or, in the third place, the passage may express something which is co tradicted by the Gospel, *e.g.* the rigid separation of Israel from t surrounding peoples in Ezra x, 10-11.

This process of specifying the questions we must take into accou in expounding any passage is more complicated than the actual proc of exposition may be, but where these questions are relevant we mu consider them. But when we have made our allowances, and tak account of qualifications, we must not forget to ask the main questio How does this passage witness to the Christian Gospel in illuminati two things—first, God's true relation to man, and second, man's tr relation to man?

But, it may be said at this point, this may be all very well, and doubt if this were done in the Church and people liked to hear t sort of thing, we should be in a much more evangelical frame of min But we have to take people as we find them, and neither inside n outside the Church is there any real passion to hear what the Bible sa or confident expectation that its message when expounded will real speak with power to the need of human lives. We need preach who know human lives from the inside; whether they know anythi about the Bible is a secondary matter. Now there is much truth he I do not, however, want to abandon the position that a really first-cl expository sermon, which, without presuming any previous familiari with the content of the Bible, really puts a great Biblical ther directly where people can hear it, may be a better method of getti across than any other. On the other hand, it is quite essential that t Church should be completely aware, at the points where its customa action needs changing, that we have moved from a sociological sit tion in which the authority and content of the Bible needed no justifi tion into a sociological situation in which there is, if anything, prejudice against anything the Bible says being either true or importa Therefore to consider that a sermon because it is expository will that account be welcomed is to live in an unreal world. We have create the taste for expository preaching because the Church and t world need it. We can only do this if we meet people's immedi

ishes in so far as we can honestly go with them, and at the same time e that our preaching is solidly expository in content. If we do not o this it is very likely that we shall find our preaching being watered own to an interest in people's present needs with sometimes more and metimes less of a Christian atmosphere and a Christian content.

The problem, then, is how to be expository in content and topical in rm. How, in other words, can we start with what people are actually terested in and yet bring them really face to face with the deep ntent of the Bible? And it must be said that there is no simple and sy answer to the problem. We have to do two things which are ifferent, and bring them together. We have to learn to handle the ible not for the sake of its immediate relevance to our practical prob-ms, but because in it we are brought face to face with God's demand n man and gift to man. We have also—because we are ministering men and women—to understand and care for the human heart. we can do each of these two things separately, then we shall not find impossible, on occasion, to bring the two things together to their utual enrichment. If we have learnt to expound, say, an epistle of e New Testament, section by section, and want willy nilly to expound directly to a congregation who have not had our experience, we shall obably strike, if not trouble, then at least apathy. But if, on the other and, we have learnt to expound this epistle, section by section, and we ave it on tap, so to speak, as background material whenever wanted, e shall probably be amazed at the opportunities which open up for e use of our knowledge of the Bible in a way that fits the human situa-ons into which we are trying to speak.

We can, however, by way of preparation, learn to think of the Bible terms of its function in the life of the Church. The material in the ible was gathered first to serve the life of the Church of Israel, and condly to serve the life of the Church of the New Testament. If we arn to think of the Biblical material in relation to the life of the Church the world, some of it may take on new life for us. There are six oupings which may be of service to us: (1) We must be able to make he best use of the stories of the Bible. Most people, even the most highly ducated, find it easiest to listen to a story, and in this hurrying, bustling orld, where most people are too tired to think, stories make an entrance here anything else is crowded out. And in this world where the sense of he living God has faded, we ought to be fully aware of the extent to which he Bible stories are saturated in the right relation of God to man and of an to man. We need a new appropriation by the pulpit of the Biblical ories. (2) There are great passages in both Old and New Testaments hich proclaim the greatness of the divine truth in ways that stir the eart and incite the devotion of the will. We ought at least to be able expound the great proclamations of the Gospel. (3) There is dis-nctive Biblical teaching upon conduct. This may not be the whole of uman conduct, but it is a great part of it. We must be able to take the reat moral teaching of the Bible in both Old and New Testaments nd make it live. (4) The Old Testament and the New Testament ompensate each other for their limitations. One of the limitations of he New Testament is that it does not deal directly with national prob-

lems. But the Old Testament does, and though we must set its teaching in the light of the full Gospel of Jesus Christ, we cannot afford not to be able to expound the great Biblical teaching on the true life of a nation and of the relation of nations to one another. (5) The Bible teaches both in Old Testament and in New the meaning of the life of the Church. We have in the life of the Church many practices which are rooted in the habit of taking the Bible seriously as the norm of the Church's life. Some of those practices are ready to be set aside, because people do not understand why they are there. It may be that the Bible as understood in the light of a true historical study may set aside some of these practices as being due to misunderstanding, but many of them will be given a new significance when their roots are understood. Here in the Scriptures is the story of the Church in her greatness and in her wretchedness. We can learn from the Scriptures how to enter into the greatness of the Church and how to cope with the wretchedness. We cannot afford not to be able to expound out of the Bible itself the meaning of the Church in the process of its life and in its triumphant vindication. (6) One of the characteristics of the present age is loneliness. But this is only an intensification of what has always been a problem and what we may have not only to endure but also to seek in obedience to God. The Bible expounds to us the pain of the lonely person and the strengthening of the lonely person by the living God. We ought not to fail the deep need of the human heart by not being able to make vivid the passages where the single person in his loneliness is sustained in the mercy of God.

I do not think of expository preaching as a simple nostrum to cure the ills of the Church. Rather, I believe there is still very much to be learnt about how to do it in this age of upheaval. I am also prepared to believe that one of the failures of the Church is that we do not sufficiently share the burden of the everyday life of men and women so as really to speak to them. But I believe that a deeper failure is that we offer men and women the husks—the outer trappings of the Gospel—and that we do not offer them the full depth of the Gospel because we cannot handle the Bible so as to make it speak with the power of Christ. This we must do. With God's help we shall learn to do it.

H. Cunliffe-Jones.

The Eighteenth-Century Anglican Divine

If an ecclesiastical ancestry and origin on both sides of his family are a reason for thinking that a man might understand something of the priest's life and labour, then Oliver Goldsmith has a claim to be heard when he writes about clerical matters. His father was the Rev. Charles Goldsmith of the Established Church in Ireland, and his mother was the daughter of the Rev. Oliver Jones, a master of the Diocesan School of Elphin. When in 1728 Oliver Goldsmith was born his father was acting as curate to his wife's uncle, the rector of Kilkenny West.

In 1744 Oliver Goldsmith entered Trinity College, Dublin, in preparation for Holy Orders, but the wish to be ordained was certainly

ore due to parental advice and sheer necessity than to personal choice. hen he left Trinity College in 1749 he was too young to be ordained, nd a period of wandering followed. In 1751 he offered himself as a ndidate for Holy Orders to Dr Synge, Bishop of Elphin, but was not ccepted, and so ended his attempt to be a priest.

Goldsmith's clerical views are usually supposed to be in *The Vicar of Vakefield* (1766) and *The Deserted Village* (1770). In his "Advertisement" to the novel he writes:

> The hero of this piece unites in himself the three greatest characters upon rth; he is a priest, an husbandman and the father of a family. He is drawn as ady to teach, and ready to obey; as simple in affluence, and majestic in iversity. In this age of opulence and refinement, whom can such a character ease? Such as are fond of high life will turn with disdain from the simplicity his country fire-side. Such as mistake ribaldry for humour, will find no wit his harmless conversation; and such as have been taught to deride religion, ill laugh at one whose chief stores of comfort are drawn from futurity.

There is little in the story which gives any peculiar light on clerical fe of the times. There is the opening and interesting statement of the icar that "I was ever of opinion that the honest man who married and rought up a large family, did more service than he who continued ngle and only talked of population. From this motive, I had scarcely aken orders a year before I began to think seriously of matrimony, nd chose my wife as she did her wedding-gown, not for a fine glossy rface, but such qualities as would wear well."

When he had his private fortune the vicar gave his stipend to iocesan orphans and the widows of the clergy. As regards his work he t himself a high standard. "I also set a resolution of keeping no curate, nd of being acquainted with every man in the parish, exhorting the arried men to temperance, the bachelors to matrimony; so that in a w years it was a common saying, that there were three strange wants Wakefield, a parson wanting pride, young men wanting wives, and lehouses wanting customers."

One other interesting point about matrimony is to be noted by the lergy, but best not to be imitated in these emancipated days. "But here was a peculiar tenet which I made a point of supporting; for I maintained with Whiston, that it was unlawful for a priest of the Church of England, after the death of his first wife, to take a second, or, o express it in one word, I valued myself upon being a strict monogamist . . . I even went a step beyond Whiston in displaying my principles; s he had engraven upon his wife's tomb that she was the *only* wife of William Whiston, so I wrote a similar epitaph for my wife, though still iving, in which I extolled her prudence, economy and obedience, till eath; and having got it copied fair, with an elegant frame, it was laced over the chimney-piece, where it answered several very useful urposes. It admonished my wife of her duty to me, and my fidelity o her; it inspired her with a passion for fame, and constantly put her n mind of her end."

The whole picture of the vicarage family reveals people "equally enerous, credulous, simple and inoffensive." In the trials and tribulations which come its way the vicar is strengthened by his faith that

beyond this vale of tears are the joys of eternity. In a sermon to his fellow-prisoners, he said: "Then let us take comfort now, for we shall soon be at journey's end; we shall soon lay down the heavy burden laid by Heaven upon us; and though death, the only friend of the wretched, for a little while mocks the weary traveller with the view, and like his horizon still flees before him; yet the time will certainly and shortly come when we shall cease from toil; when the luxuriant great ones of the world shall no more tread us to the earth; when we shall think with pleasure of our sufferings below; when we shall be surrounded with all our friends, or such as deserved our friendship; when our bliss shall be unutterable, and, still to crown all, unending."

In *The Deserted Village* there is an unforgettable picture of the village parson which surely is not altogether a poet's fiction but rather a wanderer's experience. Its writing reveals a mind peculiarly alive to, and sensitive of, clerical hopes and fears. Its very opening lines deal with a perpetual problem for priests themselves and for their bishops —the desire for one reason or another to move to some other parish. In a modest mansion and regarded passing rich on forty pounds a year,

> Remote from towns he ran his godly race
> Nor e'er had chang'd, nor wish'd to change his place.

Because the village parson was supremely content to remain in his parish, he had no ambitions for his future and so no desire to court the spurious friendship of those who might be able to help him in the matter of preferment. Nor would he need to gain an easy popularity by preaching the latest fads and fancies instead of the ageless Gospel.

> Unskilful he to fawn, or seek for power,
> By doctrines fashion'd to the varying hour.

In rescuing the wretched and relieving the pains of the vagrant train, in having open house for the aged beggars, the ruined spendthrifts, and the broken soldiers, he entered into, and bore, the sorrows and sufferings of his flock

> And quite forgot their vices in their woe;
> Careless, their merits, or their faults to scan,
> His pity gave ere charity began.

In his parochial duties he was prompt at every call made upon him, and so he watched, wept, prayed and felt for all. To win men and women from the life of sin

> He tried each art, reprov'd each dull delay,
> Allur'd to brighter worlds, and led the way.

To the dying beds of sinners he brought pardon and comfort, and from despair and anguish the dying turned to praise their God because the "rev'rend champion" stood by, and spoke to them at the hour of death.

In the venerable church he looked in keeping with the building through his meek and unaffected grace. In the pulpit he preached with gentle power the Christian Truth, and "fools, who came to scoff, remained to pray." When the church service was over the parish

ldren crowded round him in order to catch his smile, and knew that in God was their father.

> Their welfare pleas'd him, and their cares distress'd;
> To them his heart, his love, his griefs were given,
> But all his serious thoughts had rest in heaven.

n this picture of the village parson Goldsmith has painted the true racter of the good shepherd who spends himself in service, love and yer for his sheep and lambs. Simplicity and sincerity are clearly n, and he who is the good neighbour to one and all is indeed the nd of God. Behind all his active work and kindly deeds is the divine tive—"but all his serious thoughts had rest in heaven."

But Goldsmith's best comments on the priestly way and work are to be found in *The Vicar of Wakefield* or in *The Deserted Village* but n essay which is not very familiar. In the Preface to his collected ays Goldsmith says that most of them have been printed twice or ice a year. "I have seen them flourished at the beginning with praise, signed at the end with the names of Philautos, Philalethos, Philoleu-ros, and Philanthropos. These gentlemen have kindly stood spon-s to my productions, and to flatter me more have always passed them heir own."

n the particular essay now under discussion Goldsmith begins by nowledging that the English clergy receive the best education and improve it by continual study so that they excel other European sts. Further by their contact with other students, who in England east possess gentility, they are able to overcome certain "prejudices ich they are apt to imbibe even in the best regulated universities, l which may be justly termed the vulgar errors of the wise." In te of these assets, the writer is sadly aware that in England the clergy less respected than in other countries, and that their efforts in no e lead to the desired results. "Though our divines are foremost with pect to their abilities, yet they are found last in the effects of their istry: the vulgar in general appearing no way impressed with a sense eligious duty." For priests and people who to-day so often bemoan so-called decay of practising Christianity and look back on former turies as the halcyon days of religious devotion, this sentence is posite, and the more so because the writer says that he is not "for ning at the depravity of the times, or for endeavouring to paint a spect more gloomy than in nature." As he reviews English religion l life, Goldsmith sees the difference between them and continental gion and life. From his numerous European travels in Germany, nce, Switzerland and Italy he has had opportunity to see and under-nd. "No person who has travelled will contradict me when I aver the lowest orders of mankind in other countries testify on every asion the profoundest awe of religion; while in England they are cely awakened into a sense of its duties, even in circumstances the greatest distress."

When Goldsmith seeks to account for this religious apathy of the glish people, he makes a startlingly realistic statement which remains e of English priests throughout all ages. "May not the vulgar, being

pretty much neglected in our exhortations from the pulpit, be a conspiring cause? Our divines seldom stoop to their mean capacities; and they who want instruction most, find least in our religious assemblies."

Because the greater part of society is represented by "the vulgar," Goldsmith feels that special attention and training are due to them in order that they may become virtuous. The "upper classes" are generally "possessed of collateral motives to virtue," and so are less in need of moral instruction.

Divines of "real sense and understanding" prefer a prudent mediocrity to a precarious popularity as preachers. But on the whole preaching is "dry, methodical, and unaffecting; delivered with the most insipid calmness." Doubtless, preachers were not anxious to be thought "enthusiastic."

Goldsmith censures the type of preaching which is "by some called an address to reason, and not to the passions," and he maintains that the attempt "to make converts from conviction" is not likely to gain many souls, because sin is not a concern of reason but of passion. Accordingly, in order to deal with sinful passions a sermon must possess the appeal of another and a good passion. Only after this appeal has been made can reason be made to do its work. "Those who attempt to reason us out of our follies, begin at the wrong end, since the attempt naturally presupposes us capable of reason; but to be made capable of this is one great point of the cure."

To become a popular preacher—in the right sense of the words—all that is needed is sincerity and assurance, and yet Goldsmith feels that the clergy have a "faulty bashfulness" and are more impressed with a sense of awe for their congregations "than with a just respect for the truths they are about to deliver." This reticence and shyness, this lack of utter conviction and complete confidence in both the act and subject of preaching is something peculiarly English. Is it due to the subtle influence of anti-clericalism and to a certain feeling of dependence which weigh heavily on the not quite free English priest? Goldsmith notices that the French divines have a strength and dignity which become men who are ambassadors from Christ, but English preachers "like erroneous envoys, seem more solicitous not to offend the court to which they are sent, than to drive home the interests of their employer." There can be little doubt that the dark shadow of monied privilege and the presence of the squire in the pew have helped to lessen the preaching of the whole Gospel, and even to-day privilege and the squire have their new counterparts.

In a period when it was usual to write the entire sermon Goldsmith wisely draws a distinction between what is a good essay to read (and he has a right to knowledge on this point) and what is a good sermon to hear. "I never read a fine composition under the title of a sermon that I do not think the author has miscalled his piece; for the talents to be used in writing well, entirely differ from those of speaking well." It is not so much the essential matter of the sermon about which he complains, but rather about its lifeless delivery. If a preacher is convinced of the reality of his message, then he must with sincerity deliver it; he must preach and must influence. In the "enthusiasts" with a

ir courage, conviction and confidence, he sees something which ght be imitated by the Anglican divines. "Folly may sometimes set xample for wisdom to practise; and our regular divines may borrow ruction from even methodists who go their circuits and preach es among the populace. Even Whitfield may be placed as a model ome of our young divines; let them join to their own good sense his nest manner of delivery."

o the criticism that "proper assurance, earnestness and openness tyle" are not the only requisites for great preaching and that there ch a thing as pure oratory, Goldsmith wisely replies: "Let us not leceived; common-sense is seldom swayed by fine tones, musical ods, just attitudes, or the display of a white handkerchief; oratorial aviour, except in very able hands indeed, generally sinks into awk- rd and paltry affectation."

dmitting that so far all the advice he has given has been con- ed mainly with preaching to "the vulgar," Goldsmith proceeds emark on preaching to the intelligent. "To address philosophers, to obtain the character of a polite preacher among the polite—a h more useless, though more sought for character—requires a rent method of proceeding." In dealing with controversialists he ld recommend that time is not spent on dealing with each of their ctions to the Faith—he has in mind the Deists—but that the onent's position is attacked and shown to be impractical. He quotes litary writer as maintaining that attack is the best means of defence. ertheless he thinks that the clergy "might employ themselves e to the benefit of society," by declining all controversy, than by ibiting even the profoundest skill in polemic disputes. The battle the Deists has been already won so far as it can be won, because Deists "have been driven into a confession of the necessity of lation, or an avowal of atheism. To continue the dispute would endanger it; the sceptic is ever expert at puzzling a debate which he s himself unable to continue; 'and, like an Olympic boxer, generally ts best when undermost.' "

he picture of the eighteenth century divine which emerges from dsmith's pages is a high ideal, even though it is sadly lacking in view of sacramental belief and practice. Perhaps the good pastor the sincere preacher best summarize it, and such a shepherd and her have their supreme Prototype in the Gospel pages.

PATRICK COWLEY.

Studies in Texts

MARK VIII, 19, 20

I have failed to find attention paid in any commentary to the ness of this question, it seems to me that a note will not be super- us. Here are twelve disciples crossing the sea of Galilee with Jesus. y have but one loaf and they dispute about it. They had just seen s feed a crowd of 4,000 with seven loaves and a few small fishes, and many days before that He had fed a multitude of 5,000 with five

loaves and two fishes. What one would expect Jesus to say (and what commentators, indeed, assume that He did say) is, "Where is your faith? How many did I feed with five loaves? And how many with seven? Surely, then, I can feed thirteen with one loaf." What He does say, however, is this: "How many basketfuls of fragments did you take up on each occasion?" He draws their attention to the feeding in order to fasten it neither on the paucity of food nor on the number that were fed, but on the amount that was left over.

Clearly, the careful recalling of that detail in all the accounts demands consideration. In all the six accounts of a miraculous feeding we get the same word for the fragments that were collected, κλάσματα and in all the Synoptic accounts we have the same verb for the breaking κλάω. The intention of all the evangelists is to make it clear that that which was collected was not the crumbs and bits and pieces scattered about by the crowd, but the food broken by Jesus, broken and not yet distributed. A great quantity was never distributed at all. It was this that was gathered up into the twelve baskets and into the seven baskets. And that was the fact brought to the attention of the hungry disciples as they disputed about their single loaf.

Believing as I do that the stories which Mark collected survived to his use because they were in circulation as the basis of preaching, I have no doubt that the tales of the feeding of the multitudes always formed the "text" for sermons on the Eucharist. In these verses under discussion we have a pointer to one theme in such discourses, the inexhaustibility of the Eucharistic food. Jesus has gone from the earth, but He has left behind Him those who gathered up the fragments that remained and who can distribute still the food which He broke—the same word κλάω—at the Last Supper. The figure twelve, I suggest, points to the twelve apostles, and the figure seven to the seven deacons: the accredited ministers of the Church who have authority to feed the Church continually with the food of the broken Body of the Lord.

We can now see more clearly the meaning of Mark viii, 15. At first it seems that this verse has escaped from 11-13, and has no relevance to the incident of the lack of bread. But the disciples are regarded here as *distributors* of food rather than as consumers, rival distributors to the Pharisees, commissioned to distribute, not the latter's leaven, but the Eucharistic food of the Body and Blood of Christ. It was as distributors that they were rebuked. Puzzled about the problems of distributing one loaf among thirteen men, they are recalled to the inexhaustible supply of that bread which Jesus broke, bread which signifies the Eucharistic food which they were empowered to distribute inexhaustibly.

F. C. Synge.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. G. F. Woods is Chaplain of Downing College, Cambridge.

The Rev. W. S. T. Wright is Rector of Croxdale, co. Durham.

The Rev. H. Cunliffe-Jones is Professor of Systematic Theology at the Yorkshire Independent College, Bradford.

The Rev. Patrick Cowley is Diocesan Missioner in the diocese of York.

The Rev. F. C. Synge is Warden of St Paul's College, Grahamstown.

CORRESPONDENCE

MONEY OR MEN

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

I have been very interested in the Rev. Frank Bennett's article "Money or Men" in the February issue of THEOLOGY, for experience in this Dominion coming on the top of experience in the North of England, some twenty years ago, has of necessity enforced the consideration of the questions with which he deals.

The shortage of clergy, which as he suggests is likely to be accentuated rather than ameliorated, will compel the Church to recognize a position which has been developing for a good many years and which is responsible to a large degree for the general ignorance of the Christian faith which prevails over large areas of the community. The parish priest when he goes visiting, at least in urban districts, is meeting fewer of his people. For many years in the North of England, and in later years very generally, women are entering industry in increasing numbers. So that even they are seldom met with in the ordinary visiting times. Sometimes it is possible to visit in the evening, but then many are either doing the household things that could not be done during the day, or seeking some relaxation after the day's work. In such circumstances the clergy can hardly expect to be very welcome or expect to be able to do much in the way of pastoral work. Something is being done in the way of visiting factories or other industrial works where the men and increasingly the women, both young and old, are spending their days. When this is done the clergy are no doubt received with courtesy and are able to do something. But on the one hand they are there by invitation and not by right, and on the other it is by no means every priest who can take advantage of such an opportunity. It is here where the laity can fulfil their vocation. They are there by right and not just by invitation. They are there all the time and there as part of the concern. No doubt many laymen are doing great things in this direction, but they could do more if they were better equipped. Equally no doubt many are not doing much and some are ill-equipped to do anything. In this way much of what visiting used to do can be done.

This does not mean that the parish priest is released from work and so has less to do. He will still have visiting to do even if it is mainly the sick, as is the case at present. But his main work in that direction will be to train his laymen to fulfil their task of "visiting" in the places where they work. It will give a new angle to preaching and in some respects a new importance. And other means must be devised for the training of laymen in the work of evangelization and edification.

This will be more the undertaking of a piece of work that is growing in urgency, than making the best of a shortage of clergy. And for it the average priest will need much help, for much of it will be breaking new ground.

Something of this is no doubt being done, but the knowledge of what is attempted is not very widespread, nor is there much sense of its being a general obligation.

We have a long way to go before it is generally realized that the Church is more than the clergy, and that it is a ministering body in which each member is to fulfil his own function.

Yours, etc.,
PERCY HOUGHTON (*Archdeacon*).

ST MARK'S VICARAGE,
REMUERA,
AUCKLAND,
NEW ZEALAND.

April 28, 1947.

THE ARTIFICIAL INSEMINATION OF LIVESTOCK

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

In reading your report upon the Council inquiring into the question of the artificial insemination of animals I was at the disadvantage of being neither theologian nor scientist, but I had the advantage of having worked as a swineherd at the Animal Research Station of the School of Agriculture attached to the University of Cambridge.

I am glad to be able to assure the member of the Council who thought that there could be no harm provided "men did not spiritually injure themselves by indulgence in cruelty" that in all my time there I never saw anything relating to artificial insemination which in the least savoured of cruelty, and this Research Station is the place where scientific pioneer work on the subject is very largely done.

But I did sometimes ponder in my ignorant way upon the effect of this work on the minds of the scientists whose lives seemed to be devoted to the subject. A farm labourer once told me that some time previously, when the collection of sperm from some animal was about to be demonstrated to a party of students of both sexes, an old labourer strode up to a distinguished scientist and said, "Surely, sir, you are not going to demonstrate this in front of these ladies?" (There lingered in that labourer the pure manners and simple pieties of an older time.) The scientist said, "Agricultural women think nothing of it!"

Indeed they do not. We may safely leave the question of the practical value of A1 of animals to scientists and farmers, but my observation and experience have taught me that the majority of scientists will say, "If this is successful in improving the quality of animals, are there not possibilities in it for humanity?" That is the way the scientific mind works. The scientist must go on and on.

I wish our Church were better at drawing lines. Some of us believe

that the Church has the right to say what is right and what wrong. We would be encouraged if that right were more decisively exercised. Why does our Church not say, "Do this with animals if you must, but you must stop there. We shall never sanction this practice for humanity"? The Roman Church has left no doubt of her position.

Yours, etc.,
ALAN SHADWICK.

6, ESKDALE AVENUE,
OLDHAM.

April, 1947.

"CHURCH" AND "MYSTICAL BODY"

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

Indeed the Church can chant Alleluia for the deep, rich books about herself that have proceeded from the heart of Émile Mersch, but that is no reason why there should be any accepting of his most unsatisfactory terminology—*e.g.*, the distinction between "Church" and "Mystical Body," delineated in THEOLOGY, May, 1947, pp. 181-182. Though the Church is not called mystical body in the *ipsissima verba* of the New Testament, she is proclaimed Body of Christ, and her union with the Christ is declared a great mystery. No doubt the papal communion is, as other sects and heretical bodies, in a vital sense "of the great Church, the Catholic Church, the mystic Body of Christ"; but the Christ's disciples in other communions cannot allow this distinction between "Church" and "Mystical Body," cannot hand over such a word of the New Testament as "Church," nor such a label as "catholic," for peculiar pocketing and definition by the papists. "Mystical Body" may well be a phrase of great usefulness in redefining for us all the tremendous catholicity of the word "Church." Let it be used for the redemption, not the replacement, of so cardinal a term as "Church" among all Christ's people.

R. P. SYMONDS.

THE BISHOP'S HOTEL,
LINCOLN.

"THE SECRET OF ST MARTIN"

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

May I add a supplement to a recent review? It ought to be pointed out in an Anglican periodical that the judgments of the author who writes under the pseudonym of Henri Ghéon are not always acceptable to historians. M. Ghéon would be the first to admit that the fourth century is not his special period. In his *Secret of Saint Martin* he bolsters his statements with various authorities—"Sulpicius Severus," 'the historian Gervasius," "a trustworthy document," "Gregory of Tours"—and it may be that the reader who knows that Sulpicius had met Martin will accept all the evidence as of equal value. But the information given by Gregory of Tours is over 150 years later than Sulpicius and, where Martin is concerned, it is commonly regarded as

of no value. The "trustworthy document" is not earlier than the ninth or tenth century. The historian Gervasius appears to be none other than Nicholas Gervaise, who published his work as recently as 1699. M. Ghéon classifies Sulpicius as "a thoroughly truthful man." It may be said with moderation that this is not certain. The exaggerated attacks of Babut upon Sulpicius' good faith were answered by Delehaye and Camille Jullian, but even these conservative scholars allowed reservations about his thaumaturgy, which is M. Ghéon's principal interest and delight.

Your readers will perhaps argue that this caution against doubtful statements in a book clearly intended to be devotional concerns only the academic. Not so. It is not only that the Bollandists have taught us that edification is not separable from truth. An author inexpert in the history of a period naturally reads into that period his own preconceptions. M. Ghéon's preconceptions are those of a modern Frenchman, and when found in a fourth-century context they acquire a dulcet odour of antiquity. It is well, therefore, that Anglican readers should realize that some documents are of greater value as evidence for the age in which they are written than for the age about which they are written.

Owen Chadwick.

Trinity Hall,
Cambridge.

BOOK REVIEWS

Studies in Biblical Law. By David Daube. Cambridge University Press. 21s.

Here are five studies in some details of Old Testament Law. They are written with a wealth of exact scholarship, and in a clear and interesting, if repetitious, style. Dr Daube insists in a number of places that his conclusions are not in contradiction with the teaching of orthodox Judaism, but the direction of his concern is the probing of the history of the development of ideas in ancient law—for the most part irrespective of date. The worth of these studies must be assessed in the first place by those versed in the comparative study of ancient law, but to the present reviewer Dr Daube's judgment seems very uneven, and he tends to develop somewhat exiguous points with an inordinate wealth of detail.

To the theologian the most important parts of the book are (1) the section on "redemption" (pp. 39-62) in the first essay. This is a valuable supplement to and correction of the treatment of redemption in the late Dr Wheeler Robinson's *Redemption and Revelation* (1942). The value of this section is independent of the question whether one accepts the author's general argument that law preceded religion, which in the reviewer's opinion is based on dubious analogies. (2) The essay entitled "Communal Responsibility." Of this essay Dr Daube says: "In the first part attention is drawn to a case where communal responsibility is rejected, yet the corporate idea is still so strong that communal responsibility is replaced not by individual responsibility but by

communal merit. The second part is intended to show that of the large number of cases usually taken under the heading of "communal responsibility" by no means all deserve this description. There are cases which, though at first sight looking like communal responsibility, yet reflect an entirely different notion, which is here termed "ruler punishment." This is an entirely convincing essay and its theological importance is obvious.

In the rest of the book there is an illuminating study of Joseph and his brethren and a not so convincing study of Moses and the Promised Land. The short essay "Codes and Codas" is a brilliant and delightful study of how additions to the legal codes were actually made in ancient times. An essay designed to show that the idea of compensation had its place in the law of retaliation suffers from the fact that the interrelation of the ideas of retribution and compensation is not given in perspective. The last essay of 115 pages deals with instances in the Old Testament and in Roman law of the fact that the pressing of formal legal principles to their limit may defeat the ends of justice. The point is sound, but the essay might with profit have been considerably pruned.

It is to be hoped that this competent technical study of a few points in Old Testament law will help to provoke some scholar to give us a conspectus of Old Testament law as a whole.

H. Cunliffe-Jones.

Bradford.

Apostolic Succession and Anglicanism. By Felix L. Cirlot. Trafton Publishing Co., Lexington, Kentucky, U.S.A. $4.00.

Dr Cirlot is an American Episcopalian who was led by contacts with Roman Catholicism to re-examine the validity of Anglican Orders. He offers us, not an evaluation of the significance of Apostolic Succession in Anglicanism, but a reply to the Romanist attack and particularly to E. C. Messenger's *The Reformation, the Mass, and the Priesthood.* Adopting most of the Roman presuppositions about the doctrine of the Ministry, he meets the attackers on their own ground with an argument more legal than theological. This is the book's strength and limitation. It will appeal to, and reassure, those Anglicans whose theological presuppositions make them most sensitive to Romanist criticism; others may think it irrelevant because it ignores or denies what to them are the real theological issues between Anglicanism and Rome.

Within these limits an effective, even conclusive, reply is provided to each of the three lines of attack. External continuity is vindicated by the evidence for Barlow's and Parker's consecrations; the "essential form" of the Edwardine Ordinal by comparison with ancient liturgies; the Ordinal's "intention" by showing that the aim was to continue and reform the old, not to create a new, ministry; and that such an intention "to do what the Church does" is not invalidated by heretical notions about the nature and effect of the thing done. Methodist Baptisms, officially accepted by Rome, form an exact and conclusive parallel.

These points are, however, weakened by almost incidental inclusion in a far less convincing main argument—that (except for what Rome

would agree to be abuses) Anglicanism never officially modified the medieval teaching on the Ministry, the Seven Sacraments, the "Real Objective Presence" in the Elements, and the Eucharistic Sacrifice. The Church's doctrine is to be deduced from its formularies; these are to be interpreted by its *lex orandi et credendi* before their promulgation unless they contradict it so expressly and flatly that by no process of reasoning can they be reconciled with it. Even the 1552 Book contains nothing which *cannot* be squared with medieval doctrine; it therefore *must* be interpreted in a "Catholic" sense however strained that interpretation may be; and what is omitted *must* be taken to be implied. Thus both Cranmer and his opponents *thought* he had achieved a doctrinal reform, but they were mistaken. All Anglicans who do not hold substantially the medieval doctrine are therefore branded (with Cranmer) as heretics. Their membership of the Church (to which they have no right) may be unofficially connived at but can never be officially permitted. Dr Cirlot refrains from adding that this means that all Anglican theologians till Newman were heretics and that everyone—friend and foe alike—totally misunderstood the essential nature of Anglicanism for at least 300 years.

This is legalism with a vengeance, and if it were good law we might well feel bound to do as the lawyers did when the law's strict application caused injustice or absurdity—appeal to equity. But is it good law? Can the formularies be squared with the medieval doctrine except by such special pleading as no judge would tolerate? Failing any statement to the contrary, must not the Church be assumed to have adopted its formularies in the sense in which both advocates and opponents of their adoption understood them? If a new law appears out of harmony with an old one will the judge place a forced and unnatural interpretation on the later Act in order to reconcile it with the previous one? Will he not rather take it in its plain sense and assume the old law to have been amended by it? Probably few of the Anglicans and fewer still of the Romanists whom Dr Cirlot is trying to persuade will be convinced by his canons of interpretation or by the conclusions which he bases on them.

J. P. Hickinbotham.

Wycliffe Hall,
Oxford.

The Oracles of God: An Introduction to the Preaching of John Calvin. By T. H. L. Parker. Lutterworth Press. 12s. 6d.

Mr Parker has given us a readable and illuminating book on an important subject. The fact that a book about preaching should appear from an Anglican source is itself an event, and that it should be built around a study of the preaching of John Calvin makes it still more interesting.

Mr Parker opens his book by discussing preaching in the Church before Calvin, and then goes on to show how original the preaching of Calvin is when it is seen in a historical context. Somewhat unexpectedly, he claims Origen as Calvin's greatest forerunner. Calvin as a preacher is discussed with special reference to the familiar story of

his difficulties with the Church and the civil authorities at Geneva. He expounds Calvin's doctrine of preaching and Calvin's theory and practice of the art of preaching, following it with a long account of the Gospel Calvin preached. He has an interesting chapter on Calvin's influence on English preaching. He makes the claim that Calvin is the founder of the modern style of preaching which has largely formed the English preaching tradition as we have known it. The main part of the book concludes with a general discussion of preaching to-day in the light of his examination of Calvin. The book has several appendices, which include a specimen sermon by Calvin and some valuable bibliographical material.

The subject, as I say, is an important one, and Mr Parker has handled it with considerable clarity of style and simplicity of expression, but the book is nevertheless a disappointment. In his preface Mr Parker himself shows an uneasy awareness of having fallen between two stools, and it is a pity that he attempted to make his book a general introduction to the life and thought of Calvin as well as a study of his preaching. Such a general introduction would be worth producing, but here we have neither a comprehensive popular book about Calvin nor a really thorough treatment of his preaching. We could have spared the long account of Calvin's life and the summary of the theology of the Institutes, necessary though some references to both obviously are, if Mr Parker had given us some more detailed information about Calvin's actual preaching method and style, about how he treated particular themes, about his attitude to the Liturgy, and so on. The chapter on Calvin's influence on English preaching, for example, cries out for more extended treatment. Mr Parker gives no indication in the book of being aware of the work which has been done by several scholars in America recently on the significance of the "plain style." As the result of Mr Parker's too sketchy treatment, the last chapter, that on preaching to-day, while sound enough as far as it goes, is totally inadequate to the complexity and profundity of its theme.

The suspicion is left in the reader's mind that the author has been compelled to abridge a much larger work in order to meet the difficulties of present-day publishing. Whether that is so or not, it is to be hoped that he will pursue his study of Calvin and give us one day the full and detailed treatment of his preaching which we badly need.

DANIEL JENKINS.

LONDON.

SHORTER NOTICES

Saint John. Edited by B. K. Rattey. The School Clarendon Bible. Clarendon Press. Oxford. 3s. 6d.

Miss B. K. Rattey is already well known to teachers, students, and the upper forms of Grammar Schools as a writer of well-nigh indispensable Biblical textbooks. Her commentary on the Fourth Gospel in the School Clarendon Bible series is as good as, if not better than, the commentaries on the Synoptic Gospels and Acts, already published.

As regards the authorship of the Fourth Gospel, Miss Rattey accepts the traditional view that the writer was a Palestinian Jew in close touch with John, the son of Zebedee, later Bishop of Ephesus, and possibly John the Presbyter or Elder; she also maintains that the background and terminology of the Gospel are essentially Hebraic. The notes on the text are full and scholarly, yet not beyond the capabilities of School Certificate pupils.

For the purpose for which this series is intended—viz. for the use of Fifth and Sixth forms in Grammar Schools—this commentary has a distinct advantage in that Miss Rattey is not only an able Biblical scholar, but also has devoted her life to practical teaching. She knows the measure of her pupils' capabilities and has revealed how much more can be achieved by the theologian who is also a practising teacher, than by the theologian alone.

Voluntary Schools. Their place in the National System of Education under the Education Acts of 1944 and 1946. By James G. Laidler. Nat. Society and S.P.C.K. 4s.

This book will be of value to all who are involved in the position of Denominational Schools under the Education Acts of 1944 and 1946, whether such schools fall within the category of controlled, aided, or special agreement. Mr Laidler has endeavoured to collate the clauses in these Acts referring to such schools, and to determine the respective responsibilities of the Local Education Authority and the managers or governors. Of necessity there is a certain amount of repetition in the various chapters, but certain outstanding issues are clarified as a result of this book.

Approach to Christianity. By A. R. Bielby. S.C.M. Press. 2s.

On the whole this small book, which consists of a series of discussions between three Sixth Form boys and their mathematics master, is sound. Some may well find the terminology a little trying, and analogies such as that of Creation "as an enormous cooking-pot and God as the celestial chef" (p. 29) certainly tend to jar (one would suspect on the average Sixth-former as well as on the adult)! The "pedagogue" takes a very long time to arrive at any statement on Revelation or the Incarnation; when he does get there he is orthodox, but is apt to make doubtful statements in his preamble, such as that on p. 33, "You see, Christians believe that God was manifest in a man in a unique way." If one considers whether this is the type of question normally asked by Sixth-formers the answer would be in the affirmative, although they do not normally posit their questions in such a logical order! The questions set for discussion at the end of each chapter are, generally speaking, of less value than the dialogue. (Would St Paul pass question 6 on p. 63—Discuss the symbolic phrase "The Resurrection of the Body"), and some could well be eliminated.

M. S. Dawson.

Wrexham.

Date of Ezra's Coming to Jerusalem. By J. Stafford Wright. The Tyndale Press. 2s. 6d.

nce L. W. Batten's *Ezra-Nehemiah* (I.C.C. 1913) most English lars have changed the relative order of the two leaders. Mr Wright challenged this unreasonable criticism as Harold Weiner chal- ed it twenty years ago in the pages of *Journal of the Palestine Oriental ty.* Mr Wright's able and convincing statement deserves careful ution. It ends with the conclusion that the Hebrew and Greek r of Ezra before Nehemiah does not raise so many problems as has supposed. "The reversal of the order is not only unnecessary, but educes serious difficulties of such a nature that the theory can be pted only with the greatest reluctance."

Prophet" in the Lachish Ostraca. By D. Winton Thomas. The Tyndale Press. 2s. 6d.

he discovery in 1935 and 1938 at Tell ed-Duweir of twenty-one ibed ostraca was a very considerable event in Palestine archæology. se ostraca have a special importance, since they are inscribed with inuous Hebrew texts. The Regius Professor of Hebrew at Cam- ge in this interesting lecture examines the evidence provided by the aca for the belief that a prophet is mentioned in them. The only ain mention of a prophet is in Ostracon iii. l. 20, though Torczyner, editor of the ostraca, restores the word חנבצ in three other places. czyner is also anxious to identify this shadowy person with Uriah. ers have tried to identify him with Jeremiah. Mr Thomas shows no support can be found for such conjectures. There are many nymous prophets in the Old Testament. A couple of examples will ce: (1 Kings xiii, 11) "a certain old prophet" lived in Bethel. One dred nameless prophets were hid by Obadiah in a cave (1 Kings i, 4, 13).

a warning not to attempt at the present moment to establish the tity of this shadowy figure, the Professor adds some wise words of a e general application: "We shall be adopting an altogether wrong tude to Palestinian archæology—and one that will inevitably be ght with disappointment—if we come to it in the expectation that ill provide easy solutions to Old Testament problems . . . a dis- ice will be done both to archæology and to Old Testament study if e is claimed for archæology than it may legitimately be expected to d."

R. D. Middleton.

XFORD.

---

of Love: The Life of Ramon Lull. By E. Allison Peers. S.C.M. Press. 6s.

ny book, big or small, by Dr Allison Peers rightly attracts a host eaders, grateful to him for his monumental works on St John of the ss and St Teresa. In dealing with Ramon Lull and the Lullists, he a more difficult, a less immediately attractive theme, and this book true but short sequel to his 1929 biography of Ramon Lull P.C.K.). His prose, affected by Francis Thompson (see p. 13, *The*

Unhurrying Chase), is in this volume less nobly English in its dignity than his larger works. Has Professor Peers been too much affected by the rhapsodies of Father Martindale? But he succeeds in impressing the reader with the extraordinary vitality and vigour of Ramon Lull Majorcan precursor by nearly three hundred years of those equally prodigious writers St John of the Cross and St Teresa. There are says Dr Peers, about a million words in Lull's *Book of Contemplation* and an adequate summary of it would fill a fair-sized volume. Parts of it anticipate Father d'Arcy's great volume on *The Mind and Heart of Love* The account of Lull's religious romance *Blanquerna* is one of the best chapters in this very attractive book. *The Book of the Lover and the Beloved* though complete in itself is the climax of the whole of *Blanquerna* Has Professor Peers noted the striking affinity between Spanish mysticism and that of the Middle English school? The three great African missions undertaken by Lull are vividly described and the story of his martyrdom by stoning told in one poignant page. Lull's death took place between December 1315 and the following March. Professor Peers' final chapter is devoted to *Ramon Lull To-day*. Within the necessary limitations of space in this volume he gives a clear account of the controversies that followed upon the martyr's death. He rejects totally the accusation that Lull was an alchemist and finally regards him as "a patriarch of Catalan Literature, a great personality; an outstanding active-contemplative, a typical Franciscan." "He was at once formidably mystic and exquisitely human"; "he had the soul of an ascetic and the heart of a poet"; these words of Father Pascha Robinson, Professor Peers applies to Ramon Lull. ALBERT COCK.

TREGARON.

Blake: A Psychological Study. By W. P. Witcutt. Hollis and Carter 8s. 6d.

Many people are attracted by the fine poetry and powerful imagination of Blake's prophetic books, but are bewildered by the unfamiliarity of the symbols with which they deal. Mr Witcutt shows that these are no less than the archetypes and functions of the psyche which Jung reveals as lying in the Collective Unconscious and recurring in different guises in all mythologies. Blake is only more difficult to follow, for being a poet of extreme introverted vision, he has not projected his symbols but dealt purely with the life of the soul *in vacuo*. Mr Witcutt takes the four Zoas of Blake's books, Urizen, Luvah, Los and Tharmas and shows how they correspond in character to Jung's four functions of the psyche, thought, feeling, intuition and sensation. Just as each Zoa is accompanied by a Spectre or negative and repressed side and an Emanation or feminine repressed side, so too each of Jung's functions is linked with a Shadow and Anima, in the same relationship and, like Blake's, lying in the Unconscious. We know that according to Jung the normal personality is dependent on the maintenance of the delicate equilibrium of the functions and their attendant shadows and anima and trouble comes when this is upset and the personality disintegrates in consequence. The whole action of Blake's books is concerned with the

pation of one function by another; first Luvah smites down Urizen then Urizen retaliates and binds Luvah, and, there being thus among the functions, Albion, the Eternal Man who harbours n in his breast, is smitten down. According to Jung, reintegration comes about when there is reconciliation between the functions each is restored to his correct rôle. So also in Blake, and parlarly in 'Jerusalem,' the peace comes about and Albion is rejuvenl when each Zoa returns to his correct place in the conscious life of soul.

is a pity Mr Witcutt's book is so slight, but it does enough to show more detailed analysis of Blake's works along Jungian lines would ch and enlighten one's reading thereof. I would not go as far as Witcutt, however, who implies that the present obscurity of Blake's ks lies in the mere pity of his inventing his own names for common s, as though a mere change of names as of Urizen for Zeus would e all the difference to his popularity. It seems to me that this, ther with his violent rejection of accepted philosophies and religion, itutes something perverse and artistically irresponsible that irris me throughout his works. For it seems to me that no poet, however erful his imagination and verbal ability, can be truly great if he in a law and world to himself. He must be both more humble more ambitious; strive to sum up in himself and express something e common richness and fruits of our whole cultural heritage.

MARY JACKSON.

FORD.

etreat for Priests. By Ronald Knox. Sheed and Ward. 10s. 6d.

e Silence. By Father Andrew, S.D.C. Mowbrays. 4s. 6d.

ditation. By P. C. Ingrouille. Mowbrays. 1s. 6d.

ofessor Dodd in his recent work, *The Bible To-day*, warns us of danger of separating the "devotional" from the "historical" study e Bible: he writes: "Whatever response the words of Scripture may e in our minds, through meditation and waiting upon the truth, submit to control by the facts. Otherwise we are in danger of ng 'autosuggestion' for the Word of God, and missing something might tear to pieces the fantasies we have woven, and tell us truths t ourselves that we never suspected"(p. 146). This is a good test hese three books, which make a devotional use of Holy Scripture. gr Knox begins all but one of his eighteen addresses with brief Old ament studies, from the account of creation to the story of Esther. hen places beside these, "as types and antitypes," incidents from New Testament. From these pairs of passages he draws warnings encouragements for his retreatants. At first sight he seems to be a medley of passages just as pegs on which to hang his own counsels. further reflection shows that his method is not in itself unsound. the principles of God's dealings with man are written in "large rs" in the history of His chosen community both in the Old Testat and the New. Bringing relevant passages together we can discern

more clearly what these principles are, and how by them God would also discipline and enrich our individual lives. In the Bible there is "a history which we can 'live ourselves into,' and in doing so, find the meaning of our lives" (Dodd, *op. cit.*, p. 157). God has light to break forth into our lives from the patriarchs' response to vocation, and the Hebrews' wanderings, wars and apostasies, as well as from the acts of the first members of the Christian Church, the New Israel. Moreover —and here Mgr Knox and Professor Dodd are in agreement—"Church and Bible are so closely bound together in one historical complex that it is only common sense to expect the Bible to speak to us most clearly in the context of the continuing life of the Church" (Dodd, *op. cit.*, p. 163). But even there this method of applying Scripture needs handling with great circumspection. Within the Church Christians have used it to claim Biblical authority for their personal—and sometimes mutually contradictory—preconceptions. One of the danger-signs that the method has gone far beyond its due limits is when the expositor to support his thesis makes so-called historical statements contrary to established Scriptural evidence. More than once Mgr Knox does this, for example, when he seeks Biblical support for his thesis (which in itself we are not concerned to dispute) that the Eucharist is not for anyone except those "visibly united to the corporate body of Christ's faithful people," he says that our Lord "led His most ardent followers into the wilderness for the feeding of the five thousand so that "this manifestation of divine power might be witnessed only by the elect, the initiated" (p. 78). This contradicts the Gospels, which say that our Lord sailed across the lake privately with the Twelve, but crowds pursued Him, going round by the land.

Leaving aside a few deductions, which non-Roman Christians will hold as illegitimate, a more serious criticism is that these addresses might tend to lead the retreatants into repeated self-examination, rather than direct them towards the contemplation of God, which presumably should be the chief end of a retreat. Yet we acknowledge gratefully much illuminating counsel, of which one example must suffice: "Ought we not to see, in the souls of other people, the image of God ready to be formed into the likeness of Christ; Christ coming on in them, when they are at their best; Christ peeping out of them, when they are at their worst? Even the tiresome people, those whose conversation bores you, whose importunity tires you, whose outward manner offend you—you can still see in them the Crucified appealing to you out of a human soul, asking for your care, your forbearance, your compassion" (p. 184).

In the Silence is a book which all who knew Father Andrew will wish to have by them for their own meditations. Reproduced after his death from shorthand notes, there are six addresses on prayer, a retreat apparently for religious entitled "Union with the will of God," and then two shorter retreats on Psalm lxxxiv and the Epistle to the Ephesians respectively. These latter two do try to let Holy Scripture speak for itself: though now and again we find Father Andrew rather overstressing the particular aspects of the Scriptural revelation which are most congenial to him; but what preacher is not guilty of this

book tells many engaging personal anecdotes, and gives wise ce often in a striking fashion: for example, because the Bible is so little read, he says to the clergy, "You have got to be the Bible" 55).

ne third book is a course of six Lent addresses on "Temptation." re are those who will find it the most piercing and stimulating of three, largely because the preacher was content to do little more marshal what the Bible says about temptation and to let the Bible e home itself. Temptation has no close season; so this book is not ent only.

S. M. GIBBARD, S.S.J.E.

KFORD.

---

hecy and the Church. By Oswald T. Allis. The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, Philadelphia. $2.50. (English Edition: James Clarke. 15s.)

ne theme of this book is, "Whether the words of the prophets refer ne Church and have their fulfilment in this present gospel age, or over' this dispensation completely and have reference to a Jewish gdom age which may at any moment replace it." Mr Allis knows latter view as Dispensationalism. He says that it "has been ming increasingly in recent years a seriously divisive factor in gelical circles. All who accept the Bible as the Word of God and it to be the only infallible rule of faith and practice should be able and shoulder to shoulder in their opposition to Modernism and ner Criticism. But, unfortunately, Dispensationalism introduces, cannot but introduce, a cleavage which tends very seriously to ermine that unity with which Evangelicals should face the assaults epticism and unbelief." The practical outcome of the controversy Should the Christians in all the Allied countries use every effort to nade their governments to insist at the coming Peace Conference Palestine be given to the Jews?"

nis is more interesting than Mr Allis' attempt in a previous work rove the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, and there may be gelical fundamentalists who will find it quite fascinating. For rs the reading of it is likely to prove an uninspiring adventure in n world of "Bullingerism," "Darby-Scofield Dispensationalism," - and Post-Tribulationalism" and various and highly improbable ries about the Second Advent of our Lord and the Millennium.

NSFORD.

D. G. HILL.

Biblischen Grundlagen des Christlichen Humanismus. By J. Hering. Sw. Fr. 3.20.

Leben des Herrn in der Gemeinde und ihren Diensten. By E. Schweitzer. Sw. Fr. 8.50.

Urchristliche Mission. By R. Liechtenhan. Sw. Fr. 7.30. Zwingli Verlag.

hese three booklets are numbers 7, 8 and 9 of a series of monographs New Testament problems which are appearing in Zürich, under

the editorship of Professors Eichrodt and Cullmann. They represen
that combination of patient linguistic investigation with devout theo
logical insight which we have come to associate with the *Wörterbuch.*

The first of the three sets out to demonstrate that there is a specifically
Biblical humanism, which is integral to Christianity, and not an alie
importation from Hellenistic sources to be reconciled with the rugge
Hebraic thought of the Bible or else to be vehemently rejected.

The first half is devoted to a scholarly investigation of the N.T
doctrine of the Son of Man. The author examines Heb. ii, 5-8 an
Phil. ii, 6-8, and contends that the New Testament teaches that th
Son of Man was pre-existent as Man in heaven before the incarnatio
and is eternally the Image of God, after whose likeness empirical ma
was created. Anselm should have asked, not *Cur Deus homo?* but *Cur Hom
servus?* or at the most *Cur Homo homo?* The Man becomes man to restor
the reflection of the divine image which had been obliterated by th
fall. The second half of the book works out a Biblical humanism whic
is ordinary enough considering the startling conclusions of the fir
half on which it is based.

The fallacy in this new Christology seems to consist in trying to f
Jesus Christ into the strait jacket of previous Jewish eschatologic
speculations. New Testament Christology often picks up the languag
of those speculations, but it is controlled throughout by the creati
event of Jesus Christ Himself.

The second of the three books introduces English readers to the mo
recent work which has been done on the doctrine of the ministry
Germany and Switzerland, and in view of the recent symposium o
The Apostolic Ministry is particularly relevant to the discussions here.
is striking how little the authors of *The Apostolic Ministry* are aware
the works of Asmussen, Campenhausen, Dehn, Gollwitzer, K.
Schmidt and other Continental scholars whose thinking on the do
trine of the ministry has been shaped by the German Church struggl
It is here that the authors will find at once their strongest suppo
and their sharpest criticism. Instead, they concentrate their fire
Harnack, long since dead.

Continental theology has turned its back alike on the Luther
indifference to the ministry and the Calvinist use of the New Tes
ment as a blueprint for Church order. The first exposed the Germ
Church to the ravages of the German Christians. If in one age
"democratic" theory of the ministry, why not in another a ministry
the lines of the Führerprinzip? The second provides no alternative,
it treats the New Testament as if it were the Old. The order of t
Church is a doctrinal problem, and the Gospel itself creates the minis
it requires. A rightly ordered ministry will give expression to t
essential facts of the Gospel—first, that the Gospel is not a human id
but is the mission of the Son to be the Saviour of the world, a
secondly, that the Messiah perpetuates His saving activity through
members of His Body, the Church. The first fact is symbolized a
made effective through the ministry of the Apostles, who were sent
Christ was sent, and to bear witness to His sending. But their minis
of witness is perpetuated, not by a succession of accredited bisho

by the New Testament. There is, however, a ministry of the word ae Church, and this is secured by the activity of the risen Lord in Body. He empowers the different members in His Body to fulfil ain functions, and to some members He gives the gift of the ministry e word. Ordination by the laying on of hands is not a theological ssity, but merely the recognition on the part of the congregation the candidate already possesses the gift of the ministry. Yet the ster so ordained is not the mouthpiece of the congregation or of self, but of the Lord, and to this end his proclamation must abide he word of God in the Scriptures. As long as he does so he is a true ster, but when he leaves the word—and it is the responsibility of ongregation to see that he abides by it—he is no longer a minister ae Lord.

he last of the three booklets is the least interesting and important. iscusses the problems connected with the spread of the Christian rch from the ministry of Jesus to the death of Paul. It deals on iliar lines with such questions as, Did Jesus intend to found a rch to survive His death? Did Jesus countenance the admission of Gentiles into the Messianic kingdom? The author devotes two pages criticism of Prof. Dodd's thoroughgoing realized eschatology.

GBASTON. R. H. FULLER.

EW FIORETTI. Translated by J. R. H. Moorman. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

r Moorman's excellent translation for the first time (except two) English of some seventy-five stories relating to St Francis of Assisi ost welcome. The Introduction is admirably clear and impartial. e of the most delightful stories in this New Fioretti are of how Francis plained of ill-treatment; of his praise of Brother Bernard as a disciple; of his planting cabbages (full of pith); of the possession ooks; of the story of Matteo de' Rossi (not unworthy of the Gospels); e saint telling Brother Leo to wash a certain stone. All the seventy- stories add to and enrich our appreciation of the Franciscan ideal. Dr Moorman heard of the remarkable discovery made by the Francis Burkitt concerning the giving of the (supposed) new rule, he supposed voice from heaven " Ad regulam, ad regulam, sine a, sine glossa " ? Burkitt narrated his discovery and shewed tographs many years ago at a meeting of the London Society for Study of Religion and it ought to be made more widely known, many reasons. Dr Moorman is, in our judgment, a little severe t Bonaventura, but every student and lover of the Poverello will rateful to him for this exquisite collection. ALBERT A. COCK.

EGARON.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.)

KFRIARS: Richard O'Sullivan, K.C., *Christian Philosophy in the Common Law* (2s. 6d.).

KWELL: C. R. Stagg, *Confessio Fidei* (3s. 6d.).

GEOFFREY BLES: D. R. Davies, *The Sin of Our Age* (6s.); E. R. Morgan, *The Mission of the Church* (6s.); A. G. Hebert, S.S.M., *Scripture and the Faith* (5s.).

CHRIST CHURCH BOOK CASE, ST. LEONARDS-ON-SEA: Sir P. Maryon-Wilson, *The Paradoxical Society* (1s.).

CHURCH BOOK ROOM PRESS: F. J. Taylor, *Into Thy Courts* (5s.).

CHURCH HISTORICAL SOCIETY (PHILADELPHIA): John S. Higgins, *The Anglican Communion Today*; The Archbishop of Canterbury, *One Communion and Fellowship* (Address to the General Convention of the American Church) (25 cents).

COUNCIL FOR THE CHURCH AND COUNTRYSIDE: *Parish and Parson* (1s.).

DACRE PRESS: Bishop of Colombo, *The Church which is His Body* (6d.).

GOLLANCZ: H. D. Lewis, *Morals and the New Theology* (7s. 6d.).

HODDER AND STOUGHTON: Garfield Williams, *Personal Questionings* (3s. 6d.).

INDEPENDENT PRESS: P. T. Forsyth, *The Person and Place of Jesus Christ* (10s. 6d.); *The Life and the Next* (5s.).

INDIA CHURCH AID ASSOCIATION: Eyre Chatterton, *Our Anglican Church in India*, 1815–1946 (2s. 6d.).

I.V.F.: H. E. GUILLEBAUD, *Why the Cross?* (5s.).

KINGSGATE PRESS: H. Wheeler Robinson, *The Life and Faith of the Baptists* (6s.).

LUTTERWORTH PRESS: *Luther Speaks: Essays by Lutheran Pastors* (8s. 6d.); F. W. Camfield (Ed.), *Reformation Old and New: a Tribute to Karl Barth* (18s.); R. K. Orchard, *The Message of the Bible* (5s.).

MATSON'S PUBLICATIONS (ST IVES, HUNTS): Walter Roberts, *The Nutshell* (2s. 6d.).

METHUEN: Dorothy L. Sayers, *Creed or Chaos?* (5s.).

MOREHOUSE-GORHAM: William James Hughes, *Think Again* ($2.00); Bonnell Spencer O.H.C., *They Saw the Lord* ($3.00); E. R. Hardy, Jr. (Ed.), *Orthodox Statement on Anglican Orders* ($1.00).

MOWBRAY: Michael Peck, *Glad in Him with Psalms* (2s. 6d.); Reginald Lansdown, *Our Thanksgiving* (3s.); A. W. F. Blunt, *The Trials of Sickness* (1s. 9d.); F. P. Harton, *The Faith that Abides* (2nd ed.) (5s.).

SANDS: E. C. Messenger, *The Sunday Collects* (8s. 6d.); E. C. Messenger, *The Sunday Epistles* (8s. 6d.); E. C. Messenger, *The Sunday Introits and Graduals* (8s. 6d.).

S.C.M. PRESS: Gilbert Baker, *The Changing Scene in China* (6s.); Mary Entwistle, *The Bible Guide Book* (8s. 6d.); F. H. Allen, *God's Action with the Soul* (6s.); E. V. Newman, *Freedom and Control* (6s.); E. F. Scott, *Paul's Epistle to the Romans* (6s.); John C. Bennett (Ed.), *Man's Disorder and God's Design* (1s. 6d.); A. G. Hogg, *The Christian Message to the Hindu* (6s.).

S.P.C.K.: Brother Edward, *Radio Riddles* 1-7 (2d. each); H. E. Worlledge, *Towards a Christian England* (1s.); Lindsay Dewar, *In Preparation for Marriage* (4d.); Stanley Barnett, *God Be at My End* (4d.); Vivyen Bremner, *The World We Live In* (4s.); *The Canon Law of the Church of England* (15s.); W. J. Sparrow Simpson, *The Religion of Sacrifice* (2s.); H. S. Marshall. *Why Infants are Baptized* (9d.).

S.P.C.K. AND NATIONAL SOCIETY: W. H. Backhouse, *School Worship* (6d.).

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS (C.U.P.): Stephen C. Pepper, *A Digest of Purposive Values* (14s.); David Rynin (Ed.), *A Treatise on Language* (27s. 6d.).

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON PRESS: W. R. Niblett, *Essential Education* (4s. 6d.).

ZWINGLI-VERLAG, ZÜRICH: Stefan Zankow, *Die Orthodoxie Kirche des Ostens in ökumenischer Sicht* (Fr. 4.50); J. J. Stamm, *Das Leiden des Umschuldigen in Babylon und Israel* (Fr. 5.50); Kurt Guggisberg, *Die römisch-katholische Kirche* (Fr. 15.50).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher